



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,832	01/12/2004	Viktors Berstis	AUS920030667US1	9835
45993 7590 05/28/2008 IBM CORPORATION (RHF) C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ P. O. BOX 23324 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, PHILLIP H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2191				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/755,832

Applicant(s)

BERSTIS ET AL.

Examiner

Phillip H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2191

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12052007.01302008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 1/30/2008.
2. Claims 1-8 remain pending and have been considered below.

Response to Amendment

3. Per applicant's request, claims 1 and 5 have been amended; claims 9-14 have been cancelled.
4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection to claims 1, 5, and 9 over the copending application no. 10/865,347 of previous action is withdrawn in view of the submitted terminal disclaimer.
5. The rejection to claims 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. 101 of previous action is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment to cancel claims 9-14.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The information disclosure statement filed 6/6/2007 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.98 (b) and MPEP § 609 because it does not meet the requirement for the following reason "Each publication listed in an information disclosure statement must be identified by publisher, author (if any), title, relevant pages of the

publication, date, and place of publication." It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. ("Synchronizing Clipboards of Multiple Computers") in view of Seme (USPAPN. 2003/0125927).

Art Unit: 2191

As per claims 1 and 5:

Miller teaches:

receiving a user command to enable automatic cutting-and-pasting in a destination first, source second sequence, with user enablement of automatic natural language translation (see at least page 1, col. 1, 3rd paragraph "*copy-and-paste*");

subsequent to receiving said command and enablement, receiving a user selection of one or more insertion points in the contents of a destination computer resource via a destination user interface, said computer resource consisting of an electronic document (see at least page 1, col. 1, 3rd paragraph "*select an item on one computer, copy it to the clipboard (using the standard copy command available in most application), **the turn to the other computer and paste the item***");

subsequent to receiving said user-selected insertion point, receiving a user selection of one or more information elements via a source user interface (see at least page 1, col. 1, 3rd paragraph "*select an item on one computer, copy it to the clipboard (using the standard copy command available in most application), **the turn to the other computer and paste the item***"); and

intercepting transfer of said information elements to a destination (see at least page 1, col. 2, 5th paragraph "*intercepts clipboards-related system traps on the PalmPilot and redirects them to the PC clipboards*").

Miller does not explicitly teach:

determining which intercepted information elements are expressed in a natural language not matching a user-specified natural language;

performing one or more natural language handling actions on information elements which do not match said user specified natural language as defined by one or more natural language handling rules; and

transferring any information elements to said destination which have been translated to said user specified natural language as a result of said handling actions.

However, Seme teaches:

determining which intercepted information elements are expressed in a natural language not matching a user-specified natural language (see at least [0033] *"When the source language 214 is equivalent to the destination language 216, the message is transmitted directly to the destination device without translation (event 402). However, when the destination language differs from the source language, the message is passed to the content translation module 208 for translation (event 404). The translation is performed using the translation preference information 120 (FIG. 3) exchanged by each of the devices during the initiation of the session. The content **translation module 208 detects the preference indicated in the user profile 100, converts the message to the destination language** (event 406), and then transmits the newly translated message to the destination address (event 408)"*);

performing one or more natural language handling actions on information elements which do not match said user specified natural language as defined by one or more natural language handling rules (see at least [0033] "***The content translation module 208 detects the preference indicated in the user profile 100, converts the message to the destination language (event 406), and then transmits the newly translated message to the destination address (event 408)***"); and

transferring any information elements to said destination which have been translated to said user specified natural language as a result of said handling actions (***The content translation module 208 detects the preference indicated in the user profile 100, converts the message to the destination language (event 406), and then transmits the newly translated message to the destination address (event 408)***").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miller's approach to include the content translation module as taught by Seme for translating the content prior transferring it to the destination. One would have been motivated to modify because the content is translated prior to delivery, the destination device receives the message according to the destination language.

Art Unit: 2191

As per claim 3 and 7:

Miller in combination with Seme teaches all the limitations of the base claim, Seme further teaches:

wherein said handling actions comprise determining an original natural language in which each intercepted information elements is expressed, and subsequently invoking a computer translation process to translate each item from said original natural language to said user-specified natural language (see at least [0033] *"When the source language 214 is equivalent to the destination language 216, the message is transmitted directly to the destination device without translation (event 402). However, when the destination language differs from the source language, the message is passed to the content translation module 208 for translation (event 404). The translation is performed using the translation preference information 120 (FIG. 3) exchanged by each of the devices during the initiation of the session. The content translation module 208 detects the preference indicated in the user profile 100, converts the message to the destination language (event 406), and then transmits the newly translated message to the destination address (event 408)"*).

11. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. ("Synchronizing Clipboards of Multiple Computers") in view of Seme (USPAPN. 2003/0125927), and further in view of Urbe-Echebarria Diaz De Mendibil (USPN 5,426,583).

Art Unit: 2191

As per claims 2 and 6:

Neither Miller nor Seme teaches:

wherein said handling actions comprise isolating certain information elements according to said handling rules, thereby blocking their transfer to said destination.

However, Urbe-Echebarria Diaz De Mendibil teaches:

wherein said handling actions comprise isolating certain information elements according to said handling rules, thereby blocking their transfer to said destination (see at least 4:38-53 *"In order to achieve the target language sentence with its individual vocabulary, in the last phase of the system of the invention, use has to be made of the transfer rules corresponding to the second transfer and of a bilingual dictionary which makes it possible to transcribe the sentence of the target language in the interlingua into a target-language sentence with its specific vocabulary. At this level, the sentence is already actually translated and it is necessary only to extract the structural analysis from the sentence in order to arrive at the translation of the sentence into the desired language. The process transfer1- interlingua-transfer2 develops simultaneously in the system according to the invention, however, in the above description, it was preferred to separate it and give details of it in order to obtain a better understanding of said system"*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Miller in combination with Seme to include

the teaching of Urbe-Echebarria Diaz De Mendibil. One would have been motivated to modify in order to arrive at the translation of the sentence into the desired language.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM EST.

Art Unit: 2191

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PN
5/3/2008

/Wei Zhen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191

